



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON : ST. PETERSBURG.

---

LONDON, *October, 1906.*

I REMEMBER some time ago venturing, in these communications, upon a fairly easy and obvious prophecy. It was to the effect that if, as many think, the future of English politics is to be divided between a party of Socialists and a party of non-Socialists, the first token of the coming change would be a rupture between the Liberals and their semi-independent allies, the Labor Party. The events of the last few weeks have not shown that forecast to have been wrong. On the contrary, they have converted what was a speculation into a fact. They have made it clear, even to the intelligence of the average newspaper reader, that Liberalism and Labor,—Liberalism as it now is and Labor under its present direction,—are political incompatibles. The rupture that was inevitable all along has now taken place. What its ultimate significance may be, whether it really portends a gradual realignment of all English parties, is a question that a mere month-to-month diarist like myself may safely leave to time to settle. At present, one can only say that such a realignment is ardently desired and worked for by the Socialists, who, for the time being, dominate the Independent Labor Party; that one of the first fruits of their activities in that direction was bound to be a collision with official Liberalism; and that such a collision has actually occurred. Beyond that, it would be unwise to go. It was inevitable that the advocates of Socialism should begin by creating a disturbance in the field of politics. But it does not follow that, because that disturbance has taken place, the vast social transformation to which they look forward is necessarily brought any the nearer. This is a slow-moving country. It will take many years, it may take many generations,

to determine whether English Liberalism is to become imbued with a Socialistic bias. No one who knows the country can for a moment imagine that the English Liberals are going to be overrun as easily as the German Liberals have been overrun by Socialism. Thus the merely political, or rather the merely party, phase of the whole question is still a very long way from settlement. It is even too early to say that the Labor Party is destined, either as a whole or predominantly, to adopt the policy of the Socialists. It is even too early to say that the trade-unions must necessarily become Socialist organizations. Level-headed opinion will not, I think, at this moment venture beyond the bare assertion that the first outbreak of organized Socialism in English politics has had the natural result of leading to a split with the forces of Liberalism, and that the issue of the encounter does not seem likely to favor the Socialists.

Nevertheless, one can well understand the indignant irritation, not wholly free from alarm, with which the Liberals have watched the recent proceedings of Mr. Keir Hardie and his friends. Mr. Keir Hardie is the leader of the Independent Labor Party in the House of Commons. His followers number thirty, and he was chosen their leader by a majority of one. Most of them, it is perfectly safe to say, were elected to Parliament by the help of Liberal votes. As any one who has mixed in party politics will at once understand, that is a fact of capital importance. Another fact, equally pertinent and equally worth noting, is that the narrowness of the majority by which Mr. Hardie was elected to the leadership of the Independent Labor Party indicated a real difference of political opinion between himself and many of his supporters. As the man who had struggled almost single-handed through many dark years for the formation of a Labor Party, every member of which should be pledged to act independently of both Liberals and Conservatives, it would have seemed churlishly ungrateful to refuse to Mr. Keir Hardie the palpable reward of success. But there can be no question that Mr. Hardie's opinions are not at all points the opinions of his supporters. He represents the extreme section of his party. He is a convinced Socialist, and his followers, or many of them, are not. He has the aggressive and unaccommodating temperament that naturally belongs to a pioneer of Socialism in such a country as England, while the majority of his party, I believe, neither

share his views nor approve his tactics. While he is proclaiming with ceaseless stridency that Labor and Liberalism are irreconcilable, and is doing all he can to indoctrinate Labor with Socialism, the general inclination of his party, in my judgment, is to cooperate with the Liberals whenever cooperation is possible, and to keep such Socialistic tendencies as they may be conscious of well in the background. In other words, had any one but Mr. Keir Hardie been the Labor leader, it is very probable that the series of clashes which I have to narrate would have been averted. And there is a third fact which has also to be borne in mind. The Independent Labor Party are not the only representatives of Labor in the House. Outside of their ranks is a body of members directly elected in the interests of the workers in special trades and occupations, miners, for instance, and railway servants. These men at present subscribe neither to the programme nor to the Parliamentary methods of the Independent Labor Party. The presence of these detached members, whose sympathies are nearly as much with Liberalism as with Labor, disqualifies Mr. Hardie, but does not, of course, prevent him from claiming to be the spokesman of Labor as a whole.

Meanwhile, the Liberal Government has done all it could, and more than a good many Liberals relished, to meet the wishes of Mr. Hardie and his party. This was particularly evident in the case of the Trade Disputes Bill, Clause IV of which grants complete immunity to the funds of trade-unions from actions of tort. Taking into account, therefore, that but for Liberal votes at the last election there would now be no Keir Hardie in the House at the head of a party of thirty members; that Mr. Hardie's Socialism does not represent the convictions even of his own immediate followers, and flagrantly misrepresents the convictions of other members who, though outside his organization, are just as fully entitled to speak for Labor as himself; and that the present Government has strained the loyalty of its most devoted followers in attempting to satisfy Labor demands,—taking all this into account, official Liberalism might well have thought that it had purchased security from the Independent Labor Party's open attack. That, however, is very far from being the case. At a recent by-election at Cockermouth, although both local Liberals and Liberal headquarters offered to support a local Labor man, the Independent Labor Party in-

sisted on running a Socialist candidate of their own. The result was that a safe Liberal-Labor seat was handed over to a Tory. Mr. Winston Churchill at once gave strong expression to the bitterness of Liberal feelings. "I am bound to say," he declared, "that I do not think any great party would put up with the treatment they had been receiving at Cockermouth." He was followed in a day or two by the Master of Elibank, the able Scottish Liberal Whip, who roundly announced that he would do everything in his power to prevent Liberal seats in Scotland from being captured by the Socialists. Mr. Hardie was not backward in taking up the challenge. On September 17th, he said:

"The Master of Elibank had proclaimed from the housetops the truth that the Labor party must necessarily be a Socialist party; that between Socialism and Liberalism there was a gulf fixed that could not be bridged; and that the struggle must go on between Labor and both Liberalism and Conservatism until the time came when there would be but two parties in the State, the Socialist and the anti-Socialist. That was their object; they had never disguised it."

Language so vigorous and direct is rarely heard in English politics and it had an immediate effect. There was a sudden awakening of Liberalism to the fact that the Socialism it had petted and kowtowed to was in truth its implacable enemy, and a wide disposition to agree with the Master of Elibank that it might be "necessary in the future for the Liberal Party to embark upon another crusade." The crusade was, indeed, formally opened at the autumn conference of the Scottish Liberal Association on October 5th. That conference resolved by 55 votes to 34 that it is "the primary duty of the Liberal Party to present strenuous opposition to all candidates who are not prepared to dissociate themselves from the Socialist party, the avowed object of which is the complete destruction of those principles of individual liberty for which Liberalism has always contended." The Master of Elibank, who was present at the meeting, declared that Mr. Keir Hardie and his friends "looked in certain respects suspiciously like a body of malignant wreckers"; and another Ministerial Whip, Mr. J. A. Pease, stated that since the opening of Parliament 579 votes had been recorded by the Independent Labor Party against the Government, "and they had kept away and abstained from giving 2,600 votes which they

might have recorded for the Government." Speaking as a Liberal Whip, he was very sure that the Liberal Party intended to give the Socialists "very little quarter." Some of the Liberal journals have criticised the Whips for exceeding their functions in venturing upon such declarations of policy; but, whether the Master of Elibank and Mr. Pease spoke with or without the Prime Minister's authority, there can be no doubt they rightly interpreted the determination of the rank and file of Liberalism both in and out of the House of Commons.

Simultaneously with all this, the Socialists have been making a strong effort to capture such of the trade-unions as still stand apart from their organization. They have been helped in this attempt by the epidemic of strikes which, after and partly, no doubt, because of the rush of prosperity during the past year, seems now to be setting in. In South Wales, 28,000 coal-miners threaten to cease work at the end of the present month, not because they have any quarrel with the mine-owners, but in order to force non-unionists to join their organization, and also—this surely deserves to rank among the curiosities of industry—in order to compel members of the union who are behindhand in their subscriptions to pay up. At the same time, the Scotch coal-miners are demanding an increase of twelve-and-a-half per cent. on their wages, and 67,000 men may be affected. On October 1st, 6,000 boiler-makers employed in the Clyde shipyards struck work, the men asking for a five-per-cent. increase on piece-work rates and for a rise of thirty-seven cents a week on time rates. The strike, if persisted in, will probably be serious. The "black squad" is already out, and the "white squad"—that is, the shipwrights, carpenters, joiners, sawyers and so on—will be bound to follow their example from sheer lack of work. Moreover, the shipyards are the chief consumers of Scotch steel, and the steel-makers, in their turn, are the chief consumers of Scotch coal. A strike on the Clyde has, therefore, a devastating effect on allied industries; and there are those who think that Scotland may be on the eve of one of the greatest industrial struggles in her history. With the example of such a prospect to point to, and with the undoubted ferment that is at work in the mind of Labor to assist them, the Socialists have pursued sound tactics in making a special effort to attract the trade-unions to their side.

How far they have succeeded it is not easy to say. The annual

conference of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants was held a few days ago at Cardiff, and adopted two essentially contradictory resolutions. In the first place, it decided to amalgamate with the Independent Labor Party; and, in the second, it voted down a resolution directing Mr. Bell, the general secretary of the Society and the Labor M. P. for Derby, to join the Independent Labor Party and sign its constitution. This latter resolution might conceivably have passed, had it not been for Mr. Bell himself. He vehemently denounced it as Socialistic persecution of a man who refused to swallow Socialist doctrines. He went on to argue that between trade-unionism and Socialism there could be nothing but an instinctive and irreconcilable antagonism, and he warned his fellow unionists that they would find the power of their organization gone directly they submitted to the dictation of any political faction. Whether this will prove to be the view taken by trade-unions generally is, I conceive, more than doubtful. The Miners' Federation, which closed its annual conference on October 5th, spoke hardly anything but Socialism, and Socialism of the crudest character. Yet its members decided by 101,714 votes to 92,222 to abstain from joining the Independent Labor Party and to maintain their own representation in Parliament. These obviously are the confused and tentative happenings of an unsettled time, and it is difficult to assess how much the Socialists may have lost or gained by them. If they were never more actively belligerent than at this moment, they have never been met with more steadfast obstinacy. A long, stern battle is clearly beginning; and, though one feels, by instinct rather than through any process of reasoning, that the time is far off when the English people will abandon the individualistic social formation, one feels also that the Socialists from now onwards have to be counted as a force in English politics. Their activities during the past few weeks are, at any rate, an interesting prelude to what promises to be an interesting session. When Parliament reassembles on October 23, the eyes of the country will be upon the House of Lords, and speculation will be busy with the action their Lordships will take on the Education Bill and the Trade Disputes Bill. The Liberals may then find that a more or less intangible argument with Socialism will give place to the necessities of a hand-to-hand struggle with the Hereditary Chamber.

ST. PETERSBURG, *October, 1906.*

"FURNISHED lodgings to let, but not to Russians," is the legend on some of the latest notices to be seen hanging up in the windows of cozy-looking houses in Geneva and Lausanne. It marks a change in European public opinion, a noteworthy change in the attitude of liberty-loving peoples towards the Russian revolutionary movement in its latest bomb-throwing phase. And the tone of a portion of the influential European press is also modified correspondingly. A few months ago, every Russian who took part in the struggle against the Autocracy was welcomed, encouraged, extolled in western Europe as though he were a Garibaldi or a Mazzini in embryo. But the "liberationist" methods, having since then been tried in other countries of Europe, failed to find favor in the public eye. The plot, for instance, to wreck a whole train between Coblenz and Treves, because of a Russian personage who was believed to be travelling on it; the attempt made by Russian revolutionists to derail a train in Belgium; the fabrication of bombs in Geneva; the raid undertaken by Finns on the Bank of Stockholm, and the murder of M. Muller at Interlaken by a Russian girl, whose remarks when she learned that she had killed the wrong man smacked of cynicism, have gone far to provoke something like a boycott of Russians abroad.

News from Russia, however circumstantial, should be received critically. For, even when such reports are literally true, the impression they make is often erroneous. Some of the foreigners who now visit the Russian capitals are surprised to find order so well maintained, while others are disappointed at the answer they receive from the hotel porters when they ask to be taken to "the place where the fighting is going on." Even provincial Russians are astonished at the high degree of security enjoyed by the inhabitants of the two capitals as compared with that of the population of other cities. In Warsaw, Odessa, Riga, Mitau, Baku, Tiflis, every man carries his life in his hand. And, as for landowners in the country, those who still reside on their estates are little short of heroes. They know not the day nor the hour chosen by the revolutionary bandits to maltreat, torture or kill them and theirs. Armed raids are sudden, swift, unprovoked. The raiders are mere lads, often truant schoolboys, but the revolvers they carry are genuine death-dealers. To an ac-



quaintance of mine, a widowed lady, living in the heart of the country, one of these "flying columns" of the Revolution appeared one evening. The bandits were attired in sombre garments, their features hidden by black masks, their language was peremptory and laconic. "Hands up!" one of them shouted on catching sight of the lady of the house. She raised her hands and appealed to him with her eyes. In vain. "Out with all the money and valuables you possess. The organization lacks funds." She moved to her table, opened a drawer, took out four bank-notes and handed them to the leader of the gang. "Fifty rubles!" he exclaimed, with a snort. "Give us the rest and be quick about it; do it while I speak. If the revolvers once talk, their sentence cannot be recalled. So hurry up." "I have no more money," the lady mutters, half-dead with fear. "Bosh! Yesterday you received eight hundred." "Yes, but I paid them out last night, the receipts are here." "Show them." Then the black figure bent down over some stamped papers and remarked: "Well, you're in luck, and we're too late; that's all. And now give us your watch." "This watch is the only souvenir I possess of my poor husband, who is dead. I would redeem it from you if I had the money, but—" Sobs broke short the sentence. The men, more soft-hearted than the average revolutionary highwaymen, left her the watch, but took her rings, brooches and other valuables. How did they know that she had received eight hundred roubles the day before? By magic, answer the masses.

The superstitious, ignorant peasant trembles when the flying columns draw near. Not only he, but everybody else, is afraid to offend them, for they quickly resent every act of unfriendliness and their resentment takes the form of robbery, arson or murder. Like the highwaymen of olden times, their deeds are wrapped in a haze of embellishing legend which they are careful to keep up. The simple-minded husbandman, whose notions of the universe are more rudimentary than those of Homer's hearers or Rameses's subjects, is told that the revolutionists have herbs that enable them to see through walls and at long distances, that they possess glass balls which can set stones on fire and that they are endowed with such preternatural powers as the masses ascribe to wizards and witches. Yet it often happens that these legendary heroes are mere idle schoolboys out on strike. In one instance, the raw lads had not the wherewithal to buy revolvers, so

they procured one rusty pistol and a few sardine-boxes, which played the part of bombs. Their cry of "hands up" was none the less promptly obeyed; for the every-day citizen is not given to quick, sharp observation. He takes things for granted.

Again in the south of Russia, the director of a great factory, a Belgian named Potiers, was driving home in the middle of the day. When his carriage was passing a lonely spot, a boy of fifteen ran up, threw a bomb which blew the hinder part of the vehicle into shreds, and wounded Potiers in the head, shoulder, side and abdomen. Then the young hopeful escaped. A mere boy of fifteen! "How could we hang the child?" an official remarked. "It's impossible." And that is why the elder ruffians are always setting on women and children to dabble in blood. The Grammar Schools and Universities having been closed, in consequence of strikes organized by the students and the school-boys, the latter improve the shining hour by armed attacks upon people and institutions.

This element of the comic opera, however, sometimes terminates in tragedy. A curious instance took place in Shavli, a city in the province of Kovno, a couple of weeks ago. Three Grammar School boys agreed to get some pocket-money by means of an armed raid. They seem not to have realized that they were incurring any serious risks, so smoothly do such expeditions usually work. They felt about it, probably, as mediæval Christians used to feel about magic charms and formulas for evoking Satan, that if you rightly perform the ceremony and utter the traditional formula some higher Power will do the rest. The boys blithely entered a Government liquor-shop, each with his revolver levelled. Then the leader pronounced the magic words, "Hands up!" And up went all hands. "Your money or your life!" was the next order given. But, meanwhile, one of the hands which ought to have been up was perceived to be down and armed with a revolver from which several shots were fired. Two of the boys fell dead; the third told the story of the raid.

Murder by proxy, pillage by proxy, incendiarism by proxy are now making headway in Russia. Some of the most ferocious of the ruffians who slay and burn and torture in the Baltic Provinces have admitted that they were brought thither from other Provinces, and paid weekly about two and a half dollars a head. In Warsaw, according to a statement made by an ex-

perienced administrator, the Social Democrats pay thirty copecks (about fifteen cents) a head for every policeman killed by a volunteer. In St. Petersburg itself a murder was quite recently committed in broad daylight by hired assassins, just as in mediæval Italy. The Government is powerless. No Government in any country could keep order if the bulk of the population were bent on violating it or sympathizing with the law-breakers.

And yet it is easy to exaggerate the extent of the troubles, the number of the crimes, the degree of insecurity. In the two capitals little is really changed, while outwardly almost everything seems normal. The theatres there are not only opened, but are well filled; other places of amusement are nightly frequented; crowds of people amuse themselves at all times; trade is brisk, industry is progressing, there are no strikes to speak of, and one might live in Moscow or St. Petersburg for months and not witness any firing or stabbing or fighting in the streets. Space in Russia is vast, beyond the average man's power of realization; and, when all the deeds of blood are spread over one-sixth of the terrestrial globe and divided among 140,000,000 people, the effect is not nearly so striking as it first seemed.

Moreover, there is an overwhelming proportion of the people in the country who never upheld the insurrection or indeed any other political movement, horny-handed toilers who live for work and hope for heaven. But they are inarticulate and, therefore, are not counted, although they assuredly count. Then there is another section of the population, a section still growing, which until recently sympathized with the revolution, but now looks up with hope to the Crown. They are sick of bloodshed and crime, are enervated by the chronic feeling of insecurity and are apprehensive for their work, their property and their lives. In a word, the reaction which invariably follows excessive action is in full swing. The political pendulum having spent its force in one direction is now moving in the other. At present, therefore, the Crown has a fair chance to recover lost ground, to appease angry feelings, to put down manifestations of criminal instincts, to reestablish order and set the machinery of government working smoothly again. But the Government, afraid of revolutionary public opinion, is confining its efforts to the punishment rather than to the repression of crime in the Baltic Provinces, the Caucasus and Poland. Its present scope is nar-

rowed down almost to that. And, unfortunately, every task it takes in hand is tackled in the half-hearted manner which has always characterized the Russian bureaucracy.

Here is an instance. The old institution of the Censure is abolished, which was wont to peruse, examine and forbid or authorize every newspaper, book, pamphlet, leaflet and advertisement written or read by the entire Russian nation. Works can now appear in print which would have been treasonable a year ago. But, for foreign productions, the Censorship still exists. Formerly, the standing rule to the Censors was: "Be strict with writings in the Russian tongue, and indulgent when dealing with books in foreign languages." But now the practice is to allow nearly all the forbidden books to appear in Russian translations, but to proscribe French, German and English originals and reproductions. Why? a high official was recently asked. "Because," he answered, "there is an army of officials of the Censorship who would die of hunger if their places were taken from them. So they are kept on. But, being self-respecting people, they cannot come to the office and content themselves with smoking cigarettes, so they continue to do the work to which they were accustomed."

Doubtless the Government has done much to pacify the peasants who were clamoring for land, but has done it clumsily and to little political purpose. A large slice of the landed property belonging to the Imperial Family, for instance, and another vast section of land belonging to the Crown have been set apart to be expropriated and sold, on very easy terms, to the peasants whose farms are inadequate. The original idea of the Prime Minister, Stolypin, was to present all these millions of acres gratuitously to the peasants; but the Emperor's most trusted advisers dissuaded him from carrying it out because the measure would fail to strike the imagination of the masses; it would be a salient example of that expropriation which the Tsar had publicly rejected and it would oblige the loyal nobility to go and do likewise. Therefore the resolution was taken to sell the land very cheap and not to give it gratis. But the point is that the Government is adopting ways and means to realize the measure which are highly ineffectual, chief among which is the Peasants' Bank. This institution consists of a network of red tape and a number of "Circumlocution offices." It is not run on business lines, on

philanthropic lines, nor yet on political lines, and the iron has so eaten into the souls of its clerical staff that it seems incapable of being reformed. For that reason, it seems very doubtful whether the agrarian question will be settled satisfactorily and whether the Tsar will reap the benefit of his generosity.

The other principal aim of the Government is to restore order. But here, again, Ministers are timid and half-hearted. Thus for a long time they shrank from the employment of force against force, because they feared revolutionary opinion in Russia and its echo in western Europe and in America. Now they have tardily had recourse to repression in some places, while they seem to brook lawlessness in others. The Premier whose conscientiousness, integrity and patriotism are acknowledged by friend and foe alike, reckons on his subordinates' sense of duty for the maintenance of order. But his subordinates are, for the most part, trimmers. They would fain run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. A most instructive instance of their methods occurred lately in Ekarterinoslav, where peaceful people went in fear and trembling for their property and their lives. A gang of revolutionary bandits were making raids, now on one house, now on another, abstracting money, scrip, jewelry and other valuables. At last the secret police were put upon their mettle and ordered to capture the gang at all costs. But in vain. The raids continued night and day as mysteriously as ever, and they would probably be still going on were it not for the discovery, made quite accidentally, that the secret police and the bandits were working together on the footing of chums.

And if duty is thus neglected, heroism which is indispensable to the salvation of Russia is almost unknown in the ranks of the Tsar's supporters. Almost, but not entirely. The obscure soldiers and police who daily, hourly, expose their lives to the bullets, daggers, bombs of assassins at street corners are genuine heroes. In Poland and in the Baltic Provinces, numbers of them are killed or mutilated every day. Here is a typical example which occurred on September 6th in the industrial city of Lodz, near the Prussian frontier. The hero, a policeman, named Konashevich, just off duty, wended his way homewards one evening to his wife, who kept a little shop. He was accompanied by two soldiers, Volkoff and Minnagaleyeff, and all three sauntered along light-heartedly. As Konashevich entered his shop, a

stranger was seen, hurrying up to overtake him. It might be a customer, but Konashevich's wife told her husband that he was a revolutionist, a member of the fighting columns, and without losing time she darted to the door to shut it. But, before she had actually closed it a number of loud reports were heard simultaneously from three revolvers, Konashevich fell dead, while his wife and his two comrades were wounded.

Volkoff, the soldier, grievously hurt, was not beaten yet. Tightening his hold on his rifle, he crept slowly to the door and, on the threshold, was about to take aim when the revolutionists, descrying him, fired a volley and scattered his brains. Minnagaleyeff, wounded in the loins and feet, was lying outstretched on the floor during that exciting scene. When it was over, he managed to take his comrade's rifle into his safe-keeping and to remain motionless in the dark there, alone and in great pain, until the ambulance van came round and conveyed him to the hospital, where he now is.

If the intelligent supporters of the Tsar had but a little of the courage displayed by these ignorant soldiers who die unwept, unsung and generally unhonored, the cause of the Russian Monarchy would be in safe hands. For the Emperor himself has taken his stand definitely, resolutely and wisely, throwing in his lot with the Constitutionalists. And all his actions seem to be in keeping with this. Last April, for instance, General Trepoff, whose ascendancy over him was for a time unchallenged, endeavored to induce the Tsar to convoke a Zemsky Sobor, or Territorial Council, which would supplant the Duma altogether. But his efforts were vain; the Monarch was firm. On another occasion, Trepoff said to a reactionary friend of his: "The Tsar is now actuated solely by Liberal views. He is firmly determined to be true to the Liberal Platform. He has lost all faith in the Autocracy and regards that *régime* as obsolete." That is why he has recently turned a deaf ear to the suggestion, made by some members of the Cabinet, that certain modifications should be introduced into the electoral law.

But the peasants seldom even hear of these things, and never fully realize them. Nothing is done to bring home to them or to the nation at large the advantages of a reign of order and the calamities inseparable from anarchy. The revolutionists spread disaffection among them, while the Government looks on silent-

ly, deprecatingly. Yet on the voice of the peasant the upshot of the next elections and the fate of monarchism depend. Unless something is promptly done to win their vote, the new Duma will not only be oppositional—for that would not constitute a misfortune—but it will be revolutionary as well. And then the new Constitution will be rudely shaken.

Meanwhile, the parties are all moving more and more towards radicalism. One of the most prominent politicians of the day, A. I. Goochkoff, having publicly endorsed the Government programme and approved the repressive measures adopted for the restoration of order, the central Committee of his party officially dissociated itself from him; although he is their President. They are now approaching the more liberal party of "Peaceful Regeneration," in the hope of amalgamating with them. The party of Peaceful Regeneration, in turn, is desirous of joining hands with the Constitutional Democrats, while, according to Prince Meshchersky,—who himself is an inveterate trimmer and an untrustworthy guide,—the Constitutional Democrats have a hankering after the Social Democrats. "The result is," adds the Prince, "a real tendency towards Revolutionism, combined with an oral disavowal of sympathy with terrorism. On the other hand, while all these moderate parties profess to be longing for order, yet they disapprove of the use of severe and energetic measures to restore it, fancying that the Government can suppress the revolution by feeble half-measures."

The friends of the Monarchy are consequently in despair. For they hold that now or never is the sowing-time for the cause which they have at heart. Unless the seed is scattered without delay, there will be no flowers or fruit in spring and summer. The iron is white-hot to-day and might be beaten into almost any shape; to-morrow it will be cold and unmalleable. But every ministerialist is hampered by scruples; nobody dares to strike a blow. Ministers and courtiers ask each other: "Does that measure dovetail with the letter of the law? What line will public opinion take?" As if speculative opinions mattered when the issue is one of life and death! As if the state of the country were not that of civil war! *Inter arma silent leges*. No proof is needed that the gods and the wise are always on the winning side. *Væ victis*.